Remarks

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the substance of Claim 5, with further revision as discussed below. The other independent claims are also currently amended in a further effort to define over the art of record. Claims 1-4 and 6-82 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Former Claims 1 and 5, as well as independent Claims 32, 45, 58, and 70, were rejected as unpatentable over *Kullick* (US 5,732,275) in view of newly-cited *Kenner* (US 6,314,565). The applicant respectfully traverses that rejection as possibly applied to the amended independent claims and to the claims depending therefrom.

Claim 1 is amended to include limitations of former Claim 5. Furthermore, Claim 1 now also requires that the client media format controller updates the set of client media access data by accessing a plurality of remote devices each of which supports fewer than all the client media access data formats of the set of such formats. (That limitation added to Claim 1 is discussed at page 13, lines 3-12 and page 13, line 19-page 14, line 4 of the specification.)

Kullick and *Kenner* in combination do not teach or suggest a system as now defined by Claim 1. The rejection recognizes that *Kullick* fails to disclose several elements of the claimed combination. *Kenner*, with particular reference to Figure 2, is cited for updating client media format access data. However, the discussion in *Kenner* at column 6, line 56-column 7, line 8, shows several significant difference between that technique and the applicant's system as defined in Claim 1. *Kenner* describes updating the codecs installed at a user terminal, not at a client storage unit as here claimed. Furthermore, updating according to *Kenner* requires searching the user terminal to locate a "script file" at that terminal. If a local script file exists and an expiration data set forth in that file has not yet passed, then *Kenner* reuses that local script file. Otherwise, *Kenner* teaches downloading a new copy of the script file from an update service provider.

17

S/N 10/038,944   Patent

Kenner also teaches (column 7, lines 1-5) analyzing new vs. old script files to determine which codecs described in the script file are usable on the user terminal. *Kenner* thus teaches an arrangement that is relatively inefficient compared with the present invention as now defined in Claim 1, wherein a client storage unit cooperates with a client media format controller for automatically updating the <u>set</u> of client media accessed data by accessing a plurality of remote devices, <u>each of which supports fewer than all the remote media formats</u> of the set of such formats. With the arrangement as disclosed and claimed herein, the system causes updates to occur automatically and across the set of client media formats that are not all obtainable from a single source. Nothing in *Kenner* or *Kullick,* whether taken collectively or individually, would have presented to one of ordinary skill a system as now defined in Claim 1. Accordingly, that claim and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over *Kullick* in view of *Kenner.*

Independent system Claim 24, independent method Claims 32 and 45, and independent machine-readable medium Claims 58 and 70 are all amended to add limitations substantially as described above with respect to currently-amended Claim 1. Accordingly, those independent claims define non-obvious and therefore patentable subject matter over *Kullick* in view of *Kenner.*

18

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The applicant respectfully submits that all remaining claims are patentable over the applied art and solicits a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: July 13, 2006

Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

39262
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

19